

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 04 2005

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/769,786	
	Filing Date	February 28, 2004	
	First Named Inventor	Paul Brent Rivers	
	Art Unit	3721	
	Examiner Name	Paul Durand	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission: 5		Attorney Docket Number	BS030553

ENCLOSURES

(Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks:		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Name (Print/Type)	Bambi Faivre Walters	Reg. No.:	45,197
Signature	<i>Bambi Faivre Walters</i>		
Date	MARCH 4, 2005		

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION / MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.			
Name (Print/Type)	Bambi Faivre Walters	Date	MARCH 4, 2005
Signature	<i>Bambi Faivre Walters</i>		

MAR 04 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Paul Brent Rivers et al.

Group Art Unit: 3721

Application No.: 10/789,786

Examiner: Paul R. Durand

Filed: February 28, 2004

Title: "Driver Cap"

VIA FACSIMILE 703-872-9306

TC3700

Attn: Examiner Durand

37 C.F.R. § 1.8 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on: 3/4/05 (date of transmission).

Bambi F. Walters

Name of Person Faxing This Paper

Bambi F. Walters

Signature

MARCH 4, 2005

Date of Transmission

37 C.F.R. § 1.143 Request for Reconsideration
of Requirement for Restriction

Commissioner:

This paper is filed in response to the first Office Action, mailed February 10, 2005, in the above-identified application. The United States Patent and Trademark Office ("Office") imposed a restriction requirement. Assignee hereby requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this restriction requirement.

BS030553

U.S. Application No. 10/789,786 Examiner Paul Durand, Art Unit 3721
Response to Restriction Requirement

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

The Office alleges that this patent application contains three (3) groups of patentably distinct species. As 37 C.F.R. § 1.143 requires, the Assignee provisionally elects the group identified as "a. [t]he species shown in figures 1-5." The claims identifying this group are 1-11 and 19.

REPLY AND TRAVERSAL

The Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this restriction requirement. The Assignee traverses this restriction requirement by relying upon the following reasons.

1. RESTRICTION IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS

Maintaining this restriction is a violation of due process. The Office has wholly failed to factually support this restriction requirement. If the Office wishes to factually support a restriction, a second office action is then required. This second office action must follow the requirements of § 803 of the MPEP. This second office action also cannot maintain the restriction requirement — this second office action may ONLY properly present the reasons for a restriction. Once the Office properly follows § 803, and properly supports a restriction requirement, the Assignee must be given another opportunity to rebut the restriction requirement. ANY OTHER ACTION IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS.

2. NO SHOWING OF INDEPENDENT OR DISTINCT INVENTIONS

The Office makes no attempt to show the claims are independent or distinct. One criterion for restriction is that the alleged inventions in a single application must be independent or distinct. See U.S. DEPT. OF COMMERCE, MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE, § 803 (8th Ed. 2001). The Office must provide reasons and/or examples to support the requirement of restriction. See *id.*

The Office has failed to satisfy this criterion. The restriction requirement offers no explanation, nor reasoning, to support the requirement of restriction. *The Office offers no*

BS030553

U.S. Application No. 10/789,786 Examiner Paul Durand, Art Unit 3721
Response to Restriction Requirement

discussion of how, or why, the claims are independent or distinct. This restriction requirement, then, is improper and must be withdrawn.

Maintaining this restriction is, again, a violation of due process. The Office makes no attempt to satisfy their legal duty. The Office must provide reasons for a restriction, and the Office must give the Assignee an opportunity to rebut. Once the Office properly shows a burden exists on the Examiner, the Assignee must be given another opportunity to rebut the restriction requirement. ANY OTHER ACTION IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS.

3. NO SHOWING OF BURDEN

The Office provides no *prima facie* showing of serious burden. Another criterion for restriction is that there must be a "serious burden" on the Examiner. See U.S. DEPT. OF COMMERCE, MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE, § 803 (8th Ed. 2001). The Office may make a *prima facie* case for restriction, using "appropriate explanation," of i) separate classification, ii) a separate status in the art, or iii) a different field of search. *Id.* See also *id.* at § 808.02.

The Office makes no attempt at a *prima facie* case. The Office makes no mention of any burden on the Examiner. The Office makes no attempt to show the claims define inventions having separate classifications, separate statuses in the art, or different fields of search. Because the Office makes no attempt to satisfy their *prima facie* burden, the restriction requirement is improper and must be withdrawn.

Maintaining this restriction is, again, a violation of due process. The Office makes no attempt to satisfy their legal duty. The Office must provide reasons for a restriction, and the Office must give the Assignee an opportunity to rebut. Once the Office properly shows a burden exists on the Examiner, the Assignee must be given another opportunity to rebut the restriction requirement. ANY OTHER ACTION IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS.

BS030553

U.S. Application No. 10/789,786 Examiner Paul Durand, Art Unit 3721
Response to Restriction Requirement

4. REASONING IS INADEQUATE


The reasons relied upon by the Office are inadequate. The Office must concisely state the reasons for alleging either an independent or a distinct invention. See U.S. DEPT. OF COMMERCE, MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE, § 816 (8th Ed. 2001). "A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given." *Id.*

Here, however, no reasoning whatsoever is given. The Office has made mere conclusive statements without any supporting reasons. This restriction requirement, then, is not proper and must be withdrawn. ANY OTHER ACTION IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS.

The Office, in summary, has improperly imposed a restriction requirement. The Office wholly fails in their procedural duty. The Office makes no attempt to show the claims define independent inventions or distinct inventions, the Office provides no *prima facie* showing of serious burden on the Examiner, and the Office fails to provide supporting reasons. This restriction requirement, then, is a violation of due process and must be withdrawn.

If the Office has any questions, the Office is invited to contact the undersigned at (757) 253-5729 or bambi@wzpatents.com.

Respectfully submitted,



Bambi F. Walters
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 45,197
PO Box 5743
Williamsburg, VA 23188